

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-3 are all the claims pending in the application.

Reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Gupta (U.S. Patent No. 5,996,083) in view of Watts (U.S. Patent No. 6,173,409) are respectfully requested on the basis of the present amendment to the claims and the following remarks.

The Examiner acknowledges that Gupta does not disclose the central processing unit for executing an interruption processing in response to the interruption request signal output from the dividing section so as to control the output of the pulse generating section, but contends that Watts show such a central processing unit. It is also alleged that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the interrupt request signal as taught by Watts to the programmable controller of Gupta.

Watts merely teaches that an interrupt request to the CPU will issue a Wake Up signal on the RESCPU line so that the CPU and the DMA clocks can bring the system to its normal state. Watts does not disclose, among others, the interrupt request signal having a cycle which is n times as great as the cycle of the pulse string output from the pulse generating section. The further reference to Watts does not teach or suggest the deficiencies in Gupta. Thus, there is no teaching nor any suggestion in Gupta or Watts, taken singly or together, of the central processing unit for executing an interruption processing in response to the interruption request signal output from the dividing section so as to control the output of the pulse generating section.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
Appln. No.: 09/635,561

Attorney Docket No.: Q60393


Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that claim 1 is not obvious based on a combination of Gupta in view of Watts.

Independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the combination of the Gupta and Watts references for the reason above. Dependent claims 2 and 3, due to dependency, also patentably distinguish over the combination of the Gupta and Watts for at least the reasons that their base claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited art.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Yoshinari Kishimoto  
Registration No. 47,327

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE



23373

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Date: June 17, 2003